

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-22 in the application. In previous responses, the Applicants amended Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15 and 19. In the present preliminary amendment, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15 and 20. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, on page 62, second paragraph, and on page 23, second paragraph. No claims have been cancelled or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,528,513 to Vaitzblit, *et al.*. The Applicants fail to find, however, where Vaitzblit discloses acknowledging ones of predetermined events by executing code of a currently-active context as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 8. (*See*, for example, the Decision on Appeal of April 23, 2007, page 7, second paragraph.) Thus, Vaitzblit does not teach each and every element of independent Claims 1 and 8. As such, Vaitzblit does not anticipate Claims 1 and 8 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102(b) rejection with respect to Claims 1-4 and 8-11.

II. Rejection of Claims 5-7 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected the above dependent Claims over Vaitzblit in view of: U.S. Patent No. 6,009,454 to Dummermuth, *et al.*, for Claims 5 and 12; U.S. Patent No. 5,239,652 to Seibert, *et al.*, for Claims 6 and 13; and U.S. Patent No. 6,256,659 to McLain, Jr. *et al.*, for Claims 7 and 14. As noted above, Vaitzblit fails to teach acknowledging ones of predetermined events by

executing code of a currently-active context. The Applicants also fail to see where Vaitzblit suggests the same. The above references have not been cited to cure the noted deficiency of Vaitzblit but to teach the subject matter of the above dependent Claims. Additionally, the Applicants do not find where the above references cure the noted deficiency of Vaitzblit and respectfully request the Examiner to indicate otherwise if the Examiner disagrees. As such, the above cited combinations do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claims 1 and 8 and dependent Claims 5-7 and 12-14 which include the elements of Claims 1 and 8, respectively. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allow issuance of Claims 5-7 and 12-14.

Furthermore, dependent Claims 6 and 13 have been amended to include placing a processor in an idle state *in response to* all foreground and background tasks *being* inactive. (See also amended dependent Claim 20 and the Decision on Appeal, page 16, first paragraph.) The Applicants fail to find where the cited references teach or suggest these amended dependent Claims.

III. Rejection of Claims 15-18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 15-18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaitzblit in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,713,038 to Motomura. As discussed previously, Vaitzblit does not teach or suggest acknowledging ones of predetermined events by executing code of a currently-active context as recited independent Claim 15. Motomura has not been cited to cure the deficiencies of Vaitzblit but has been cited to teach the use of a plurality of registers. (Examiner's Final Action, page 5). The cited combination of Vaitzblit and Motomura,

therefore, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 15 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 15-18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Rejection of Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaitzblit and in further view of Dummermuth, Motomura, Seibert, McClain or a combination thereof. As discussed previously, Vaitzblit does not teach or suggest each element of amended independent Claim 15. Furthermore, the Applicants fail to find where Dummermuth, Motomura, Seibert, McClain or a combination thereof cure the deficiencies of Vaitzblit.

Since Vaitzblit does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claim 15 and Dummermuth, Motomura, Seibert, McClain or a combination thereof does not cure its deficiencies, and does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of dependent Claims 19-21 which includes each and every element of Claim 15. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 19-21 and allow issuance thereof.


V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-22.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: June 25, 2007

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800